



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,482	06/10/2005	John Malcolm Gascoyne	JMYT-337US	2843
23122	7590	04/10/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			TALBOT, BRIAN K	
P O BOX 980				
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,482	Applicant(s) GASCOYNE ET AL.
	Examiner Brian K. Talbot	Art Unit 1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 6,7,13 and 14 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0/10/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

1. Claims 1-14 remain in the application.

2. Claims 6,7,13 and 14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend upon another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 6,7,13 and 14 have not been further treated on the merits.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. It is noted that Applicant has supplied a front page of the WO 03/103077 on 11/30/04 but this does not conform to the information required by the Office (see below).

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, step c, it is unclear whether or not the application of the proton-conducting polymer solution is applied to the fired catalyst ink, the GDS or both? Clarification is requested.

Regarding claim 2, it is unclear whether the term N,N-dimethylacetamide is referring to a solvent or the proton-conducting polymer. Clarification is requested.

Regarding claim 8, steps a and b, are confusing. The Examiner questions how applying a catalyst ink forms a gas diffusion electrode and questions wouldn't firing the catalyst ink form the electrode and not the step of applying? Clarification is requested.

Step e, the step is confusing. The Examiner questions how and by what process is the electrode and polymer combined? Is this not already performed with steps a-d? Clarification is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5,8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hards et al. (5,501,915) in combination with Weber, "Study of Nafion films on electrodes prepared from dimethylacetamide solution".

Hards et al. (5,501,915) teaches a method of incorporating proton conducting polymer into an electrocatalyst layer wherein a catalyst layer is applied to a GDS, and a solution of proton conducting polymer is subsequently applied to the catalyst layer. The electrocatalyst is formulated into a catalyst ink by dispersing in water and adding a suitable binder. The catalyst ink is applied to the GDS by a suitable process such as screen printing or spraying. Thereafter a solution of proton conducting polymer is applied to the electrocatalyst layer. The proton-conducting polymer can be Nafion (col. 5, line 30 – col. 7, line 5 and col. 8, lines 42-67).

Hards et al. (5,501,915) fails to teach the claimed solvent, N,N-dimethylacetamide.

Weber, "Study of Nafion films on electrodes prepared from dimethylacetamide solution" teaches mixing a proton-conducting polymer (Nafion) with a solvent comprising N,N-dimethylacetamide and applying this to an electrocatalyst electrode.

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to have modified Hards et al. (5,501,915) proton-conducting polymer solution to include N,N-dimethylacetamide as the solvent with the expectation of achieving similar success.

Regarding claims 4,5,11 and 12, the claims recite that the catalyst is support or unsupported. Hards et al. (5,501,915) teaches that it is known to have support and unsupported platinum electrodes (col. 3, lines 1-5).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian K Talbot/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

BKT